



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/516,630

05/12/2005

Christian Kotter

4836-000012/NP

4564

27572 7590 03/12/2009
HARNESSE, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 828
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER

SANDERS, JAMES M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1791

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/12/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/516,630	Applicant(s) KOTTER ET AL.	
	Examiner JAMES SANDERS	Art Unit 1791	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 February 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-22, 24, 25 and 27-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-22, 24, 25 and 27-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 19-21, 31, 32 and 35 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. In the reply filed February 18, 2009, claims 19-21, 25, 31-32, and 35 were amended.

Claim Objections

Claims 19-21 are objected to because of the following informalities: in each claim, In 2 recites "molded parts is profiled" which appears to be a misstatement of "molded parts are profiled".

Claims 31-32 are objected to because of the following informalities: in each claim, In 2 recites "molded parts has an average" which appears to be a misstatement of "molded parts have an average".

Claim 35 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 35, In 2 recites "molded parts is released" which appears to be a misstatement of "molded parts are released".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1791

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claims 18, 20-22, 24-25, 27-28 and 36-37 can be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacKay (GB 360 968 A, already of record), and further in view of Picagli et al (EP 0089029, already of record).

For claims 18 and 27, MacKay teaches a method for the preparation of material having a leather-like surface, comprising the steps of: applying a pulp comprising leather fibers, suspending agents, binders and optionally additives, to the porous surface of a vacuum tool; applying a vacuum in the vacuum tool to deposit pulp to a desired layer thickness along the porous surface; and transferring the material to a press tool and applying pressure to remove moisture and densify it (pg 1, lns 19-92). Mackay does not explicitly teach a vacuum tool having the geometry of a three-dimensional molded part.

However, the vacuum tool "screen" disclosed by MacKay is capable of being arranged into a three-dimensional geometry, and a mere change in shape would have been within the level of ordinary skill in the art. Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include this option which is well within his or her technical grasp, for the benefit of forming an object of three-dimensional structure. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 1791

art at the time the invention was made, when changing shape to a three-dimensional geometry, to take care in applying the pulp uniformly around the three-dimensional screen since MacKay teaches spreading it in a thin layer (pg 1, lns 24-28).

MacKay does not teach pulp containing leather fibers in an amount of from 0.1 to 10% by weight and a majority of the fibers have a length of from 0.2 to 3 mm or from 0.3 to 3 mm.

However, Picagli et al, in the same field of endeavor of reconstituted leather manufacture, teach that a pulp is employed which contains leather fibers of a length less than 0.25 in (pg 11, ln 11, note 0.25 in = 6.35 mm).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify MacKay in view of Picagli et al, to employ pulp which contains leather fibers of a length of from 0.2 to 3 mm or from 0.3 to 3 mm., since the methods lend themselves to optimization, and since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. One would have been motivated to perform routine experimentation for the purpose of optimizing process parameters. Please see *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 for further details.

Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use pulp containing leather fibers in an amount of from 0.1 to 10% by weight, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. One would have been motivated to perform routine

Art Unit: 1791

experimentation for the purpose of optimizing process parameters. Please see *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 for further details.

For claims 20-21 and 25, MacKay does not teach that the reconstituted leather is dried and the reconstituted leather is provided with a surface finish and that the surface properties of the reconstituted leather can be modified by embossing, grinding, plasma treatment, corona treatment, sand blasting or shot blasting.

However, Picagli et al teach that the reconstituted leather is dried (pg 17, ln 15) and the reconstituted leather is provided with a surface finish and that the surface properties of the reconstituted leather can be modified by embossing, grinding, plasma treatment, corona treatment, sand blasting or shot blasting (pg 19 lns 6-13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of MacKay with the teachings of Picagli et al for the benefit of producing reconstituted leather resembling conventional leather, as suggested by Picagli et al (pg 19, lns 12-13).

For claim 22, MacKay teaches that the porous surface of said vacuum tool is formed from a material selected from the group consisting of a sintered powder metal, a ceramic, a metal foam, and a plastic foam or screen (pg 1, lns 82-83, i.e. leave a deposit on the screen).

For claim 24, MacKay does not teach that said pulp contains leather fibers in an amount of from 0.5 to 2% by weight.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use pulp containing leather fibers in an amount of from 0.5 to 2%

Art Unit: 1791

by weight, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. One would have been motivated to perform routine experimentation for the purpose of optimizing process parameters. Please see *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 for further details.

For claim 28, MacKay teaches that said binder is selected from the group consisting of natural rubber, polyurethane, polyacrylates, dispersions of acrylic esters, vinyl esters and isobutylene polymers and mixed polymers, or a vinyl acetate (pg 2, lns 60-61, i.e. India-rubber latex).

For claims 36 and 37, MacKay teaches that a pulp is employed which further contains non-collagenous fibers and that said non-collagenous fibers are selected from the group consisting of cellulose, cotton and/or plastic fibers (pg 2, lns 25-30, i.e. beaten vegetable fibers such as cotton, hemp, etc.).

5. Claims 19 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacKay, further in view of Picagli et al, and further in view of Dimiter (US Patent 4,287,252, already of record).

For claim 19, the previous combination does not teach that the reconstituted leather is profiled.

However, Dimiter, in the same field of endeavor of reconstituted leather manufacture, teaches an improved reconstituted leather that is profiled (cl 3, lns 17-19, i.e. the web...is buffed on both sides to expose the natural leather particles).

Art Unit: 1791

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of MacKay/Picagli et al with the teachings of Dimiter to obtain the benefit of a profiled skin.

For claims 29-30, Dimiter teaches that said binder is present in an amount of from 10 to 50% by weight, based on the dry weight and that said binder is present in an amount of from 15 to 30% by weight, based on the dry weight (cl 2, ln 21, i.e. 15% to 25% binder).

6. Claims 31-33 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacKay, further in view of Picagli et al, and further in view of Barash (US 3,542,910, already of record).

The MacKay/Picagli et al combination does not teach that the drying step comprises the polymerization, polycondensation, cross-linking and/or film forming of the binder and that the reconstituted leather has an average dry layer thickness of from 0.1 to 6 mm or that the reconstituted leather has an average dry layer thickness of from 0.1 to 2 mm.

However, Barash, in the same field of endeavor of reconstituted leather manufacture, teaches that the drying step comprises the polymerization, polycondensation, cross-linking and/or film forming of the binder (cl 4, lns 71-75 and cl 5, lns 1-20) and that the reconstituted leather has an average dry layer thickness of from 0.1 to 6 mm or from 0.1 to 2 mm (cl 5, lns 23-24, note 0.24 in = 6 mm and 0.08 in = 2 mm).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of MacKay/Picagli et al with the teachings of Barash for the benefit of using an efficient drying step and a desired uniform thickness, as suggested by Barash (cl 5, ln 23).

Art Unit: 1791

7. For claims 38-40, Barash teaches a part having a leather-like surface, comprising furniture, clothing, accessories, installation parts, veneers and trims and that said trim are selected from the group consisting of floor trims, pillar trims, trunk trims, door trims, dashboard trims, switches, gearshift levers, seat cushions, seat rests, doorknobs and steering wheel covers (cl 5, Ins 47-49, i.e. can be used in place of high grade natural leathers in such applications as shoes, clothing, upholstery...).

8. Note that “even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.” In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

9. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacKay, further in view of Picagli et al, and further in view of Sato et al (US Patent 4,919,189, already of record).

The MacKay/Picagli et al combination does not teach that a mold with mobile slides for forming undercuts is employed.

However, Sato et al, in a method of casting involving a slidable die to form an undercut, teach the concept of employing a mold with mobile slides for the benefit of forming undercuts (cl 1, Ins 56-59).

Art Unit: 1791

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of MacKay/Picagli et al with the teachings of Sato et al for the benefit of being able to form undercuts.

10. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacKay, further in view of Picagli et al, and further in view of Purser (US Patent 5,232,643, already of record).

The MacKay/Picagli et al combination does not teach that the reconstituted leather is released from the surface of the vacuum tool and provided with a foam backing or injection-molded backing.

However, in the same field of endeavor of reconstituted leather manufacture, Purser teaches providing a reconstituted leather with a foam backing or injection-molded backing (cl 3, lns 1- 24, i.e. foam adheres directly to the rear face of cloth covering).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of MacKay/Picagli et al with the teachings of Purser for the benefit of being able to provide a foam backing.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 18, 20-22, 24-25, 27-28, 31-33 and 36-40 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMES SANDERS whose telephone number is 571-

Art Unit: 1791

270-7007. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Del Sole can be reached on 571-272-1130. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JMS

/Joseph S. Del Sole/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791